

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise more in disappointment than in anger. I am the Democratic member of the task force on the contested election in the 46th District, the district of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ]. I have not taken to the well of the House or to the podium upstairs in the press gallery to talk about the disturbing pattern that has developed in this investigation.

Several days ago, the House Oversight Committee adopted a resolution providing for the issuance of interrogatories. The resolution clearly stated that there would be consultation with the ranking minority member. There was none. There was no discussion regarding the process or the substance of these interrogatories, directly contrary to the resolution of the committee.

What happened last week, unfortunately, is consistent with the pattern that has been established in this case. It has not been, I repeat, it has not been, a fair one. It has not been a process which has reflected a desire to proceed in a cooperative way to effect the ends of a fair investigation.

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON IRS ABUSES

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, when was the last time that the American people saw such a spectacle as last week, when the Senate Finance Committee conducted hearings on the IRS abuses? Listen to some of the shocking things that we heard.

IRS agent Jennifer Long, a 15-year veteran with the agency, actually told the Senators that the management of IRS systematically concluded that Americans who reported less than \$20,000 in income a year were tax cheats because nobody can live on that income.

Well, I have got some people back home who would totally disagree with that, especially seniors who live on fixed incomes every day, and they get by on a lot less than that.

IRS agents are not told to go out and be just, to be fair, to use good judgment to enforce their laws. No; they are told to go out and raise as much money as possible. If they do not shake down enough money, their careers could be in jeopardy.

And now the White House is asking the very same agency that is out of control to reform itself. Maybe this is the most amazing spectacle of all.

STOP ATTACKS ON PUBLIC EDUCATION

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Republican assault on education is nothing new. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the radical Republican right have a plan to dismantle public education, abolish the Department of Education, cut the school lunch program, cut funding for safe and drug-free schools, for teacher training, for Head Start. To these attacks on our children, Democrats have said "no."

Now Republicans have a new scheme: Drain funding from public education and give it to a privileged few to attend private school. Reward the few and punish the many. That is the Republican plan. To that I say "no" and Democrats say "no." Democrats believe in investing in education for all of our children, improving, reforming, and strengthening our public schools.

Mr. Speaker, 99 percent of our children attend public school. We need to work to improve our public schools. Stop attacks on public education, Mr. Speaker. Our children deserve better.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 262 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 262

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1122) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions, with Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House a single motion that the House concur in each of the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, the Committee on Rules met to grant a rule that provides for a motion to concur to the Senate amendments to H.R. 1122, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1997 in the House. It is a simple rule that provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Supporting this rule and the motion to agree to the Senate amendments will allow us to complete the long leg-

islative process on this bill. H.R. 1122 would then be ready to be sent to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, where the President will again have the opportunity to end the cruel procedure known as partial-birth abortion.

During the Committee on Rules hearing yesterday, we heard impassioned pleas to make two amendments in order, one by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] and one by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. Neither of those amendments were ruled in order.

I respect their heartfelt sentiments on this emotional issue. But I would like to point out that if we went through the normal legislative process, going to conference with the other body and working out our differences, the subsequent conference report would not be amendable either.

It may be alleged that the majority on the Committee on Rules is trying to cut off debate on this issue. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are merely trying to complete this legislative process in a timely manner.

The two proposed amendments have not gone through the normal process. They have both expanded the scope of the bill and contain language that should be carefully deliberated by my colleagues so that we are all completely sure what they mean.

□ 1045

With respect to H.R. 1122 and the Senate amendments, the two substitute amendments offered by the minority are irrelevant. The amendments would ban third-trimester abortion except to save the mother's life or health.

While that may sound perfectly reasonable, the vast majority of partial-birth abortions are performed in the fifth and sixth month of pregnancy, not the third trimester. Further, the health exemption would effectively permit all abortions. The Supreme Court interprets health abortions so broadly as to include all those related to social, psychological, financial, or emotional concerns. I realize that the Hoyer amendment defined health in another manner.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY], chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, provided testimony that indicated that there was still a great deal of latitude given to abortionists to determine if the health exemption applied.

Despite all the attention that will be given to what is not on the floor today, I would now like to focus on what is going to be on the floor today, a ban on the brutal procedure known as partial-birth abortion, with protection for the life of the mother, and let me be perfectly clear that if her life is in jeopardy, the ban does not apply, and fines and possible prison terms for physicians who violate the ban and perform this atrocity.

This resolution will allow us to vote on accepting three acceptable, simple Senate amendments which delete some